

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 94 04:30:07 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #258
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 14 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 258

Today's Topics:

 440 in So. Cal.
 Outsider's reaction to no-code license. (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 14 Jun 1994 00:48:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!uhog.mit.edu!
news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ken A. Nishimura (kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU) wrote:

: The rules state, that if a uncoordinated repeater causes
: interference to a coordinated repeater, then the uncoordinated
: repeater has primary responsibility to fix the problem (97.205).

If the uncoordinated repeater is transmitting and then the coordinated
repeater starts transmitting on the same frequency, which one is guilty
of interference? i.e. what is the definition of interference in this
context? Not a trick question... just curious.

73, KG7BK, 00TC, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: 13 Jun 1994 23:56:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Outsider's reaction to no-code license.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I recently saw an advertisement for a weekend educational program to obtain a no-code license. I have had a long interest in HAM radio but have been put-off by the code requirement. Now, I may be ready to pursue a license.

I tuned into this group specifically to see what insiders reactions were to this development. In perusing the discussions I gather that many will still consider people such as myself lazy or stupid for their reticence to learn code.

Lazy? No! I simply do not have the time to gain proficiency in an aspect of the hobby that is uninteresting and non-essential for its proper conduct. Even if I were interested in sending/receiving code, I would rather spend my limited time learning the intricacies of computer interfacing and translation of Morse code. (I have been using ASCII coded alpha-numerics in computer programming for years without the need to memorize the actual numerical codes!)

As to the question of stupidity, I can only say I have managed to earn two doctorate degrees.

It is worrisome that many of the HAM community hold the attitude that their activity must be protected from the great "unwashed" masses -- including those who are willing and able to learn the essentials for its legal operation. The attitude that beginners must be properly "initiated" is potentially destructive because I can't think of many other activities that are as vulnerable to the whims of the legislature as is HAM radio.

I feel that the Morse code requirement for HAM operation represents the most blatant aspect of HAM radio's "avocational featherbedding". In comparision to HAM, ask yourself how much education does the general/commercial aviation pilot, marine operator, or taxicab driver have in RF theory. The message is clear, practicality subjugates everything else and as the need for bandwidth increases a small, elitist group of hobbyists will not be protected by straw fences! You will need numbers.

Repent! (or not?)

--

Ronald Jones rj+@osu.edu | Office: (614) 292-1665

The Ohio State University | FAX: (614) 292-7493

Date: 13 Jun 94 23:14:58 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!noc.near.net!
news.tufts.edu!news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Outsider's reaction to no-code license.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2tiro7\$8mp@charm.magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu>, rj+@osu.edu (Ron Jones)
writes:

> It is worrisome that many of the HAM community hold the attitude that
> their activity must be protected from the great "unwashed" masses --
> including those who are willing and able to learn the essentials for its
> legal operation. The attitude that beginners must be properly
> "initiated" is potentially destructive because I can't think of many
> other activities that are as vulnerable to the whims of the legislature
> as is HAM radio.

No flame intended.

An opinion about what goes on over the air formed by reading posts to the net
is as misleading as an opinion of Usenet formed by what might be
said about it over the air.

Please, visit a friend with a 2 m or 70 cm rig or use/borrow a scanner to
listen to what goes on over the bands available to no-code Technicians.
I think you'll find what you were hoping for. At least your "many" will
become "some", if any, and then it will no longer be as worrisome.

Then . . . go for it!

Date: 14 Jun 94 00:45:37 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-
mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2sib8p\$sq2@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <2sl3tv\$p5j@hacgate2.hac.com>,
<CSLE87-130694092818@145.39.1.10>fo
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Karl Beckman (CSLE87@email.mot.com) wrote:

: Now, to the actual comment about "official" coordinating bodies: There are
: NO technical, tenure, territorial, or even amateur licensing requirements,

: just on of being recognized by the amateurs eligible to operate repeaters
: and auxiliary stations in the area you coordinate for. As long as you meet
: the FCC's definition (noted above), you are AN official repeater
: coordinator.

: Any number of different coordinating groups can handle a single piece of
: real estate. There is no requirement for unanimous or even majority
: agreement among them before a station is considered to be coordinated, so
: long as ONE coordinator certifies the station. Thus, if I want to put up a
: coordinated repeater at any location, all that I have to do is establish
: myself as a coordinator for the specified location by agreeing to represent
: ALL eligible hams in those 10 square feet (just me, funny thing!). Then I
: grant myself a letter of approval and I may choose to submit the entry to
: the ARRL directory or other local or regional repeater index for
: publication.

: The statements and opinions expressed here are not those of Motorola Inc.

You may want to check with your Lawyers on this issue. You seem to quote
the law but forget that the law is interpreted. These issues have come
before the fcc administrative law judges. In essence any number of
coordinators in a given area Must Agree. This interpretation comes after
multiple coordinators in a given band in southern california. Do you
beleive it? This tends to keep ALL coordinators honest.

The ARRL has strict guidelines in publishing repeater entries when there
are two or more coordinators in a given area. Read your Directory.

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: Mon, 13 Jun 94 21:32:25 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <hm0sPVb.edellers@delphi.com>, <2tge6l\$kah@ccnet.ccnet.com>,
<2thlsf\$t0i@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Michael P. Daignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> writes:

>So, in essence, a coordinated repeater can have exclusive use of a frequency
>pair in relation to other coordinated repeaters.

Then what do other amateurs who do not have access to the coordinated repeater
do?

If you say "stay off the pair," you're demanding something the FCC does not
allow.

Date: Mon, 13 Jun 94 21:39:00 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2tfjlv\$ah8@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <061394035153Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CSLE87-130694112152@145.39.1.10>, 0
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Karl Beckman <CSLE87@email.mot.com> writes:

>Although I don't understand why Bob insists on perpetuating the myth of the
>"open repeater", I certainly agree with the FCC and both of you that the
>owner/licensee of a repeater may impose any conditions he desires, other
>than compensation for profit, to utilize his station. And that many
>operators NEED restrictive conditions in order to improve their technical
>and operating skills, in line with 97.1

"Open repeaters" are not a myth -- they are very real, and exist when a licensee
chooses to operate in that fashion. Just because there's no difference in
legal status doesn't mean that there isn't a difference in real life.

Date: 14 Jun 94 04:35:01 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-
mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CSLE87-100694154250@145.39.1.10>, <hm0sPVb.edellers@delphi.com>,
<2tge6l\$kah@ccnet.ccnet.com
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

> <Jm3Mvvg.edellers@delphi.com>
Organization: home in the cAVE wondering
Distribution:

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:

```
:It sounds to me as though you want repeaters to be granted the exclusive use
:of frequency pairs -- in other words, if a repeater is coordinated on
:147.135/735 no other amateur can use the FREQUENCY without permission of that
:repeater's licensee. Sorry, but the FCC rules clearly state that frequencies
:must be shared by all amateurs licensed to use them.
```

You would find 20 meters useless if there were contesters on every frequency piled up 24 hours a day. I am sure that you agree Part97 says this is to be allowed. Through coordination ie net control and the general cooperative spirit of amateurs this band does work even on contest weekend.

I would hope that good amateur operating practices doesn't allow this to happen.

--

In article <CSLE87-130694112152@145.39.1.10>,

Karl Beckman <CSLE87@email.mot.com> wrote:

>Now isn't it strange that the Amateur Radio Service exists specifically in
>part to extend "...the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the
>advancement of the radio art;" for "advancing skills in both the
>communication and technical phases of the art;" and for "expansion of the
>existing reservoir of trained operators, technicians, and electronics
>experts ."

>Yet, the predominant comment from coordinators and owners of existing
>one-to-a-pair repeaters is that technical solutions won't work until the
>politics are right. Maybe the political problem is that these guys forgot
>why they became hams instead of GMRS users, or more basically that they
>haven't read 97.1 yet, much less 97.101!

I've read 97.1. I've read 97.101. Neither is a lawsuit shield. Until you can keep coordinators from getting sued, reality will dictate that coordinators don't do anything that is guaranteed to get them sued. Forcing owners to share coordinations will get them sued.

Don't believe me? Try it. I've been there.

Since you're complaining about the basis and purpose of ham radio, why aren't you helping to populate the higher bands? Where's that spirit of technical innovation now?

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
To Sarah Brady, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, and Charles Schumer:
Thanks. Without you, I would be neither a gun owner nor an NRA life member.

Date: 13 Jun 1994 23:06:07 -0600

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!

mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CSLE87-060694105004@145.39.1.10>, <2t57a1\$i3k@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<CSLE87-100694173103@145.39.1.10>

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

"Are you absolutely sure you want to do this? [ny]"

Well... uh... it's a dirty job, but someone has to do it.

In article <CSLE87-100694173103@145.39.1.10>,

Karl Beckman <CSLE87@email.mot.com> wrote:

>THat's true, but they have NEVER said that you can't have more than one
>repeater in an area on the same channelpair. In fact (here we go again,

>read the rules word for word, don't guess at what the field office says)
>97.101b SPECIFICALLY PROHIBITS allocation of any frequency "for the
>exclusive use of any station." Now, using your example, since your
>committee is denying the purchaser of the second repeater fair and equal
>use of his equipment, should the coordinator be forced to pay the
>difference in value?

You keep bleating about 97.101b. Who, exactly, are you claiming COULD attempt to allocate a frequency for the exclusive use of an amateur station if it weren't for that rule? That is, after all, who 97.101b directly affects. It isn't the frequency coordinator. He has no power to do so, for entirely practical reasons: he can't write, or get the FCC to write, a pink slip the moment an uncoordinated repeater goes on the air. His job is purely advisory. He advises the new repeater trustee what pair his repeater can operate on without interference. He advises the FCC, in rare cases where there's interference, who he'd advised could operate there without interference and who he didn't. THAT'S IT.

The coordinator isn't denying the second repeater owner anything. He's just telling him, in the case that's generating all this controversy, that there's no frequency that he can recommend to the new owner to place his repeater on that will be free from interference...just the facts. Objective, independently verifiable facts.

>Yes, but 97.205 ONLY applies to the repeater stations themselves; that's
>why it's NOT in the general rules section but in the section dealing with
>repeater stations. As an example, your ID goes off every three minutes
>while my second repeater is in use. If my repeater is coordinated, you've
>got to fix the problem

So far, so good...

>by listening on the output and not transmitting
>while the output channel is busy.

Not necessarily. There are other solutions, one of which is that you turn your repeater off altogether. Another is that you work out coverage patterns with the other trustee, if he's willing to be cooperative. The rules mandate no specific solution.

> If I'm NOT coordinated, my users are SOL.

True.

> But if one of your USERS keys up the system while one of my guys is on the
>air, he's PERSONALLY on the hook for deliberate interference to another
>radio communication (97.101d) ON THE INPUT, even if your repeater has the
>lockout receiver and your system does NOT key up.

Not necessarily; that's true only if he can hear the output of the other repeater and so knows someone else is talking, and if his transmission prevents the other user from being intelligible through the other repeater.

>The FCC Rules, although politically motivated, do not make allowance for
>the particular whims of those who want nobody else heard on the output
>frequency of their repeater.

That's cold comfort to a coordinator who's facing the loss of his family's livelihood because he forced an unwilling trustee to share frequencies and got his butt sued off. I'd argue that a coordinator who did that was irresponsible in the extreme, for he has failed to provide for his family's needs through his own actions.

Like it or not, that's how it works in the real world.

>No, the FCC may have a bit of enforcement to do, but you signed up for the
>education part when you agreed on your last license renewal that you had a
>copy of the FCC Rules. Every coordinator (who holds an amateur license -
>it's NOT required, you know!) needs to open up his personal copy, notice
>which portions of text are in which sections, and then stop spreading false
>interpretations to the local or regional amateur community.

That would be true if your interpretation was correct. I don't think it is, simply due to the nature of coordination. I'm not saying that coordinators can assign frequencies; I am saying that coordinators recommend frequencies, and advise respective trustees of the possible consequences of not following that recommendation.

BTW, you didn't raise it in this message, but I'll discuss briefly your argument about who can and cannot be a coordinator: I think that's a serious bug in the current system. I submitted an op-ed piece to QST about how I think it should be done, but it was rejected... Basically, I think that the ARRL should be designated national frequency coordinator for the amateur service. They then would turn around and delegate that authority to local coordinators, who would be familiar with local conditions and make decisions in accordance with that knowledge.

This would, in addition to several other problems, solve yours: it would bring the coordinators under FCC jurisdiction, and rules could be passed which would actually be binding on them.

>Legally you can't afford NOT to, since the trustees have NO LEGAL SAY in
>the coordination process. And neither your or my FCC license nor the FCC
>Rules include any conditions of third-party permission before I can operate
>my station as a repeater, in exactly the same manner as that third party
>who happens to have made a claim to a specific frequency.

Got deep pockets? Want to finance defending the test case? I can't afford to. The legal process isn't bound by 97.101b.

>Then the answer to the question was "No, we do NOT find a frequency with
>the least impact on other amateur stations." Now read 97.101b and consider
>how you would adjust your past coordinating practices to comply with the
>law.

97.101b doesn't apply. I don't attempt to assign a frequency.

>I think you'd better stop at 220, since in all the higher bands amateurs
>are shared secondary users and subject to primary allocation to others at
>any time.

The vast majority of the others you refer to are military users, who are ecstatic to share with hams; they know we'll go away at a moment's notice if they need it.

> Another unjustified reason the owners will use to call their
>lawyers and haul the coordinator in to court. It's especially bad because
>Part 97 includes no legal basis for frequency coordination in the first
>place, so you can't use that document as a defense.

If I can't use it as a defense, how do you suggest we use 97.101b as a defense? You can't have it both ways.

>Have you ever picked up the phone, dialled, and gotten a busy signal?

Sure. What does this have to do with it? Your next question is a much better analogy:

> Or
>in real busy times you might not have even gotten a dial tone.

Actually, no, I haven't. The phone company works very hard to see that this doesn't happen. They, too, plan based on peak usage, not average.

> Why do you
>feel that a hobby is entitled to a better grade of service than the general
>public? That's why the requirement for sharing is specifically codified
>into the rules.

I don't.

That requirement applies to amateur stations, not coordinators.

>No, I meant that the bandwidth might be narrower and capture isn't taking

>place, but you still can't legally chase everyone else off "your" channel,
>whether the local committee said you were coordinated or not, especially
>when you aren't actively using it for communications..

OTOH, if someone is interfering with you, you can most certainly complain. I know of no case where a coordinated repeater had a complaint to the FCC against an uncoordinated repeater upheld where there was no actual interference.

>Adherence to "the way we do it" got tossed out with segregation in the
>sixties. The pattern of repeated violations and denial of equal access to
>the amateur spectrum that your society records clearly document could also
>get you into serious trouble under the RICO statutes. Unfortunately it
>will probably take more federal lawyers to get the private voluntary
>coordinators to start complying with rules that have been in place for more
>years than most have been licensed.

This would be laughable if it weren't so scary: you may just have provided some gonzo, lawsuit-happy repeater wannabe an idea to impoverish his local coordinator with...especially since it has no basis in fact, being based on a specious premise: that coordinators have the power to deny access to spectrum.

>If the coordinators would simply state the technical terms including tone
>access in their letter of coordination, instead of blindly saying "This is
>the way our existing owners want it done" the process could begin. You
>also really need to include somewhere in your correspondence that "All
>frequency grants and station licenses are issued solely by the FCC..."
>ending with 97.101b, just like the commercial guys do it.

Nice try. It completely ignores the real world, though.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
To Sarah Brady, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, and Charles Schumer:
Thanks. Without you, I would be neither a gun owner nor an NRA life member.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #258
